

July 2001  
To appear in Phys.Lett.B

## A mirror world explanation for the Pioneer spacecraft anomalies?

R. Foot and R. R. Volkas,<sup>\*</sup>

*School of Physics  
Research Centre for High Energy Physics  
The University of Melbourne  
Victoria 3010 Australia*

### Abstract

We show that the anomalous acceleration of the Pioneer 10/11 spacecraft can be explained if there is some mirror gas or mirror dust in our solar system.

---

<sup>\*</sup>E-mail address: foot@physics.unimelb.edu.au, r.volkas@physics.unimelb.edu.au

The unaccounted-for component of acceleration observed for the Pioneer 10 and 11 spacecraft presents an interesting scientific mystery [1,2]. These spacecraft, which are identical in design, were launched in the early 1970's with Pioneer 10 (11) approaching Jupiter (Saturn). After these planetary rendezvous, the two spacecraft followed hyperbolic orbits near the plane of the ecliptic to opposite ends of the solar system with roughly the same speed, which is now about 12 km/s. The radiation pressure decreases quickly with distance from the sun, and for distances greater than 20 AU it is below  $5 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm/s}^2$  allowing for a sensitive test for anomalous forces in the solar system [1]. The Pioneer 11 radio system failed in 1990 when it was about 30 AU away from the Sun, while Pioneer 10 is in better shape and is about 70 AU away from the Sun (and still transmitting!).

Interestingly, careful and detailed studies of the motion of Pioneer 10 and 11 have revealed that the acceleration of *both* spacecraft is (or was in the case of Pioneer 11) anomalous and directed roughly towards the Sun [1,2], with magnitude

$$a_p = (8.7 \pm 1.3) \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm/s}^2 . \quad (1)$$

Many explanations have been proposed, but all have been found wanting so far (for a review see [2]). In this paper we point out that a cloud of mirror matter gas or dust in our solar system could account for the observations by inducing a drag force.

We first briefly review the mirror matter idea. One of the most natural candidates for a symmetry of nature is parity (i.e. left-right) symmetry, an improper Lorentz transformation. While it is an established experimental fact that parity symmetry appears broken because of the chiral asymmetry of weak interactions, this actually does not exclude the possible existence of exact or unbroken parity symmetry in nature. This is because parity (and also time reversal) can be exactly conserved if a set of mirror particles exist [3,4]. The idea is that for each ordinary particle, such as the photon, electron, proton and neutron, there is a corresponding mirror particle, of exactly the same mass as the ordinary particle. The electromagnetic, weak and strong forces are also doubled. In the modern language of gauge theories, the mirror particles are all singlets under the standard  $G \equiv SU(3) \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$  gauge interactions. Instead the mirror fermions interact with a set of mirror gauge particles: the gauge symmetry of the theory is doubled to  $G \otimes G$ . (The ordinary particles are, of course, singlets under the mirror gauge symmetry [4].) Parity is conserved because the mirror fermions experience  $V + A$  mirror weak interactions while the ordinary fermions experience the usual  $V - A$  weak interactions. The two sectors are almost decoupled, but they interact gravitationally and in general through other subtle effects such as the photon - mirror photon mixing we will exploit below.

Mirror protons and electrons are stable for the same reasons that ordinary protons and electrons are stable. Mirror matter thus provides a candidate for the inferred dark matter in the universe [5]. Several astrophysical puzzles can potentially be resolved by mirror matter. For example, observations of gravitational microlensing [6] in the galactic halo suggest the presence of compact objects averaging roughly half a solar mass. The most reasonable conventional candidates, white dwarfs, pose serious phenomenological problems through the heavy element background that should have been produced by the progenitor stars [7]. Mirror compact objects are not subject to this objection [8]. Large close-in extra-solar planets [9] came as a surprise, because they could not have formed at their detected

locations if they are made of ordinary matter. It is possible they are instead made of mirror matter [10] (the conventional alternative is that they formed further from their stars and then migrated in). The qualitative mirror image of such a system is an ordinary planet orbiting a mirror star. Such hybrids could also exist. Indeed, we have speculated that the objects termed “isolated planetary mass objects” [11] may not be isolated at all, but rather they could be ordinary planets orbiting invisible stellar companions composed of mirror matter [12] (this can be tested by Doppler observations). The last two examples illustrate the likely segregation of ordinary and mirror matter. While hybrid systems should exist, for phenomenological (and theoretical) reasons one expects very uneven mixtures: mainly ordinary matter with a small amount of mirror matter, and vice-versa. Our solar system could contain a small amount of mirror matter (for bounds on mirror matter in the Earth see Ref. [13]).

While gravity is the predominant common interaction, small non-gravitational interactions are also possible and could be very important. Due to constraints from gauge symmetry, renormalizability and parity symmetry it turns out that there are only three non-gravitational ways in which ordinary and mirror matter can interact with each other [4,14]. These are via photon - mirror photon kinetic mixing, Higgs - mirror Higgs interactions and via ordinary neutrino - mirror neutrino mass mixing (if neutrinos have mass). While Higgs - mirror Higgs interactions will be tested if or when the Higgs particle is discovered [14,15], there is currently interesting evidence for photon - mirror photon kinetic mixing from the orthopositronium lifetime puzzle [16] and also ordinary neutrino - mirror neutrino mass mixing from the observed neutrino anomalies [14,17].

Since neutrino physics is in a state of flux, a short digression is warranted: If neutrinos have mass then a necessary consequence of the parity symmetry of the theory is that each of the ordinary neutrinos  $\nu_{e,\mu,\tau}$  oscillates maximally with its mirror partner  $\nu'_{e,\mu,\tau}$ . This provides a simple and predictive solution to the solar and atmospheric neutrino anomalies which is also compatible with the LSND [18] signal [17]. This mirror world solution predicted [17,19] the energy independent recoil electron spectrum observed for solar neutrinos at Super-Kamiokande [20] as well as the observed  $\sim 50\%$  flux reduction obtained in the gallium experiments [21]. It also predicted the maximal mixing observed in atmospheric neutrino experiments [17].

It is true though that the explanation of the neutrino anomalies does not provide a perfect fit to all of the neutrino data. In particular, the low Homestake result is about 3 sigma less than the predicted  $\sim 50\%$  flux reduction. (Homestake measures about one-third of the expected value for solar neutrinos while six other experiments measure about one-half). Recent SNO data disfavors  $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu'_e$  oscillations at about the  $3\sigma$  level [22]. This result arises from a comparison of SNO charged current results with Super-Kamiokande electron elastic scattering measurements, both of which are dominated by systematic uncertainties. Finally some atmospheric data disfavour maximal  $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu'_\mu$  oscillations at about the  $1.5 - 3\sigma$  level depending on how the data is analysed [23,24]. A convincing test of the mirror world explanation of the neutrino anomalies will be provided soon by SNO's neutral/charged-current measurement. This should provide a solid result ( $> 7\sigma$ ) one way or the other.

In field theory photon - mirror photon kinetic mixing is described by the interaction

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{\epsilon}{2} F^{\mu\nu} F'_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2)$$

where  $F^{\mu\nu}$  ( $F'_{\mu\nu}$ ) is the field strength tensor for electromagnetism (mirror electromagnetism). This type of Lagrangian term is gauge invariant and renormalizable and can exist at tree level [25,4] or may be induced radiatively in models without  $U(1)$  gauge symmetries (such as grand unified theories) [26–28]. One effect of ordinary photon - mirror photon kinetic mixing is to give the mirror charged particles a small electric charge [26,27,4]. That is, they couple to ordinary photons with electric charge  $\epsilon e$ . It turns out that orthopositronium is peculiarly sensitive to photon - mirror photon kinetic mixing [27] and the anomalous vacuum cavity experiments suggest that  $\epsilon \simeq 10^{-6}$  at  $5\sigma$  level [16].<sup>†</sup>

Any mirror matter in our solar system may have formed planets or small asteroid-sized objects and there may also be some mirror gas or mirror dust<sup>‡</sup>. Collisions of mirror matter space bodies with the Earth will result in observable effects if the photon-mirror photon kinetic mixing is large enough. The  $\epsilon \simeq 10^{-6}$  figure suggested by the orthopositronium anomaly is sufficiently large. It has been argued in Refs. [34,35] that various observed events such as the Tunguska explosion may have been due to the collision of the Earth with a mirror matter space body.

Now, the Pioneer 10/11 spacecraft are very sensitive probes of mirror gas and dust in our solar system if  $\epsilon \simeq 10^{-6}$ . Collisions of the spacecraft with mirror particles will lead to a drag force which will slow down the spacecraft<sup>§</sup>. This situation of an ordinary matter body (the spacecraft) propagating through a gas of mirror particles is dynamically the ‘mirror image’ of a mirror matter space body propagating through the atmosphere which was considered in Ref. [34]. For  $\epsilon \approx 10^{-6}$  it turns out that the relative momentum between the spacecraft and mirror atoms is lost (up to random thermal motion) after the mirror atoms penetrate a distance within the spacecraft of roughly [34]

$$z \sim 0.1 \left( \frac{10^{-6}}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \left( \frac{v}{10 \text{ km/s}} \right)^4 \text{ mm.} \quad (3)$$

Because the mirror atoms lose their relative momentum within the spacecraft the drag force is of the usual form,

$$F_{drag} = \rho_{mirror} A v^2, \quad (4)$$

---

<sup>†</sup>This is large enough to be cosmologically significant, because photon - mirror photon mixing would then bring the mirror sector into thermal equilibrium with the ordinary plasma prior to the big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) epoch [29]. This is consistent with the recent microwave background anisotropy measurements [30,31], but it would suggest a modification of standard BBN such as a suitably large relic neutrino asymmetry [32].

<sup>‡</sup> Some possible effects of mirror planets in our solar system have been discussed recently in Ref. [33].

<sup>§</sup> It was originally thought that a drag force could not explain the anomalies because of Ulysses data [1], however latter it was found that large systematic errors apparently due to gas leaks made Ulysses data unreliable for a test of the anomalous acceleration [36].

where  $\rho_{mirror}$  is the density of mirror particles in the solar system in the path of the pioneers and  $v, A$  is the spacecraft speed and cross sectional area respectively.

The sign of the anomaly is consistent with a drag force because the spacecraft are travelling in a direction which is close to being radially outward from the Sun. A drag force due to the interactions of ordinary matter cannot explain the anomaly because of stringent constraints on its density [2]. However the constraints on mirror matter in our solar system are much weaker because of its invisibility as far as its interactions with ordinary light is concerned. Given the spacecrafts' mass of 241  $kg$  and cross sectional area of about 5  $m^2$  [2], Eq.(4) can be re-written in the form:

$$a_{drag} \simeq 10^{-7} \left( \frac{\rho_{mirror}}{4 \times 10^{-19} \text{ g/cm}^3} \right) \left( \frac{A}{5m^2} \right) \left( \frac{v}{12km/s} \right)^2 \text{ cm/s}^2 . \quad (5)$$

Thus, the anomalous acceleration measurements of the Pioneer 10/11 spacecraft suggest a density of mirror matter in the solar system of about  $\approx 4 \times 10^{-19} \text{ g/cm}^3$ .

The approximately constant nature of the Pioneer anomalies requires that the density be roughly constant in the plane of the ecliptic to within about 20 – 30% between 25 – 60 AU. We cannot prove that mirror matter will form such a configuration. It depends on the abundance, the interactions of the mirror matter with the ordinary matter disk, and also to some extent on initial conditions. The total amount of mirror matter required does not seem unreasonable, however. It corresponds to about  $few \times 10^5$  mirror Hydrogen atoms per cubic centimetre (or equivalent). If the mirror gas/dust is spherically distributed with a radius of order 100 AU, then the total mirror mass would be about that of a small planet ( $\approx 10^{-6} M_{\odot}$ ) with only about  $10^{-8} M_{\odot}$  within the orbit of Uranus which is about two orders of magnitude within present limits [37]. If the configuration is disk-like rather than spherical, then the total mass of mirror matter would obviously be even less. The requirement that the mirror gas/dust be denser than its ordinary counterpart at these distances could be due to the ordinary material having been expelled by solar pressure.

Fortunately the uncertainty over the mirror matter configuration does not preclude an experimental test of our hypothesis. It could be tested if another spacecraft moving with a different speed or with a different ratio of cross-sectional area to mass were used on a future mission. The Cassini mission already launched in 1997 and due to reach Saturn in July 2004 and also the proposed Pluto/Jupiter mission may provide suitable tests. Also, our hypothesis would be falsified if an anomalous acceleration were observed to be directed radially inward for a spacecraft that was *not* travelling radially outward.

## Acknowledgement

RF is an Australian Research Fellow. RRV is funded by the Australian Research Council and the University of Melbourne. Part of this work was done while RRV was in the hospitable surroundings of Università di Roma I “La Sapienza”. We would like to thank Michael Nieto for patiently answering some of our questions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. D. Anderson, P. A. Laing, E. L. Lau, A. S. Liu, M. M. Nieto and S. G. Turyshev, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 2858 (1998).
- [2] J. D. Anderson, P. A. Laing, E. L. Lau, A. S. Liu, M. M. Nieto and S. G. Turyshev, gr-qc/0104064.
- [3] T. D. Lee and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. 104, 256 (1956); I. Kobzarev, L. Okun and I. Pomeranchuk, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 3, 837 (1966); M. Pavsic, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 9, 229 (1974).
- [4] R. Foot, H. Lew and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Lett. B272, 67 (1991).
- [5] S. I. Blinnikov and M. Yu. Khlopov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 36, 472 (1982); Sov. Astron. 27, 371 (1983); E. W. Kolb, M. Seckel and M. S. Turner, Nature 514, 415 (1985); M. Yu. Khlopov et al, Soviet Astronomy, 35, 21 (1991); M. Hodges Phys. Rev. D47, 456 (1993); Z. G. Berezhiani et al, Phys. Lett. B375, 26 (1996); Acta Phys. Polon. B27, 1503 (1996); Z. Berezhiani, D. Comelli and F. L. Villante, Phys. Lett. B503, 362 (2001); A. Yu. Ignatiev and R. R. Volkas (in preparation).
- [6] MACHO Collaboration, C. Alcock et al, Ap. J.542, 281 (2000).
- [7] K. Freese, B. Fields and D. Graff, astro-ph/0007444; B. Fields, K. Freese and D. Graff, Ap. J. 534, 265 (2000).
- [8] Z. K. Silagadze, Phys. At. Nucl. 60, 272 (1997); S. Blinnikov, astro-ph/9801015; R. Foot, Phys. Lett. B452, 83 (1999); R. Mohapatra and V. Teplitz, Phys. Lett. B462, 302 (1999).
- [9] M. Mayor and D. Queloz, Nature 378, 355 (1995).
- [10] R. Foot, Phys. Lett. B471, 191 (1999); Phys. Lett. B505, 1 (2001).
- [11] M. R. Zapatero Osorio et al., Science 290, 103 (2000); see also, M. Tamura et al., Science 282, 1095 (1998); P. W. Lucas and P. F. Roche, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 314, 858 (2000).
- [12] R. Foot, A. Yu. Ignatiev and R. R. Volkas, astro-ph/0010502, Astropart. Phys. (in press).
- [13] A. Yu. Ignatiev and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Rev. D62, 023508 (2000).
- [14] R. Foot, H. Lew and R. R. Volkas, Mod. Phys. Lett. A7, 2567 (1992).
- [15] A. Yu. Ignatiev and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Lett. B487, 294 (2000).
- [16] R. Foot and S. N. Gninenko, Phys. Lett. B480, 171 (2000).
- [17] R. Foot and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Rev. D52, 6595 (1995); R. Foot, Mod. Phys. Lett. A9, 169 (1994).
- [18] LSND Collaboration, C. Athanassopoulos et al., Phys. Rev. C54, 2685 (1996); C58, 2489 (1998); Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3082 (1996); 81, 1774 (1998); A. Aguilar et al., hep-ex/0104049.
- [19] R. Foot and R. R. Volkas, hep-ph/9510312; See also R. Crocker, R. Foot and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Lett. B465, 203 (1999); R. Foot, Phys. Lett. B483, 151 (2000).
- [20] S. Fukuda, Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, hep-ex/0103032.
- [21] SAGE Collaboration, J. N. Abdurashitov et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 4686 (1999); GALLEX Collaboration, W. Hampel et al, Phys. Lett. B447, 127 (1999); GNO Collaboration, M. Altmann et al, Phys. Lett. B490, 16 (2000).
- [22] SNO Collaboration, nucl-ex/0106015.

- [23] Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 3999 (2000).
- [24] R. Foot, Phys. Lett. B496, 169 (2000).
- [25] R. Foot and X-G. He, Phys. Lett. B267, 509 (1991).
- [26] B. Holdom, Phys. Lett. B166, 196 (1986).
- [27] S. L. Glashow, Phys. Lett. B167, 35 (1986).
- [28] M. Collie and R. Foot, Phys. Lett. B432, 134 (1998).
- [29] E. Carlson and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Lett. B193, 168 (1987).
- [30] Boomerang Collaboration, C. B. Netterfield et al., astro-ph/0104460; Maxima Collab, A. T. Lee et al., astro-ph/0104459; Dasi Collaboration, N. W. Halverson et al., astro-ph/0104489.
- [31] See also, for example, S. Hannestad, astro-ph/0105220; Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 4203 (2000).
- [32] See, for example, H.-S. Kang and G. Steigman, Nucl. Phys. B372, 494 (1992); J. Lesgourgues and S. Pastor, Phys. Rev. D60, 103521 (1999); P. Di Bari and R. Foot, Phys. Rev. D63, 043008 (2001).
- [33] Z. K. Silagadze, Acta. Phys. Pol. B32, 99 (2001); R. Foot and Z. K. Silagadze, Acta. Phys. Pol. B32, 2271 (2001).
- [34] R. Foot, hep-ph/0107132.
- [35] R. Foot, Acta. Phys. Pol. B32, 2253 (2001).
- [36] J. D. Anderson, P. A. Laing, E. L. Lau, A. S. Liu, M. M. Nieto, S. G. Turyshev, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1891 (1999).
- [37] J. D. Anderson et al, Ap. J. 448, 885 (1995).